



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

to use force at its own discretion were applied to civil life, every individual would become judge in his own cause, the "right of the fist," as the Germans call it, would be restored, and civilization, with its organized system of civil law, would be broken up. There is no more ground for barbarism in international affairs than in common social life. Nations are just as interdependent in their relations as individuals. No nation in controversy ought to be judge of what justice demands.

Once more, Mahanism exalts brute force above reason and moral forces, and declares it to be the final and supreme factor in civilization, the *sine qua non*, without which certain great moral accomplishments can never be expected, without which the world cannot get up to the highest heights of Christian righteousness. What is this but utter lack of faith in humanity? Is it the brute that is left in man which is to lift him? Captain Mahan confesses, however, with apparent unconsciousness of the contradiction, that the "sword has no power over intellect or moral assent." He does not tell us by what process, then, it can cure moral evils in society.

Finally, Mahanism, in its effort to give war a remedial character, overlooks entirely the multitudinous brood of moral evils which war always brings forth. It ignores the evils of great armaments, the crushing and degrading burdens of taxation imposed by war and preparations for war, the deplorable moral deterioration which it produces in society in the way of vice and lawlessness, the international hatred, suspicion and contempt which it begets, and the peril of new war which constantly follows in the wake of war. To talk of war being remedial is like proposing to cure smallpox by new injections of the nasty poison into the blood. From a professional militarist's point of view a strong navy or a powerful army may be a grand and desirable thing, but from the point of view of the national security, peace and general prosperity in the long run, growing armaments on sea or land made to meet the necessities supposedly created by the bloated military establishments and ambitious policies of other powers are, instead of being remedies, themselves the cause of maladies as deep-seated and dangerous as ever afflict a nation.

Editorial Notes.

Prayer for Peace. The Evangelical Alliance of the United States (William E. Dodge, president, L.

T. Chamberlain, secretary) have sent out an earnest and timely appeal to all Christians in the nation to devote the week from January 6 to 13, inclusive, to united prayer for the coming of God's Kingdom. For the 10th and 11th the subjects suggested for which prayer shall be offered are thus phrased:

"Thursday, prayer for right relations in Society and the nation, with the Golden Rule obeyed as between

man and man, and all social and political action guided by justice and goodwill,—the Christian ideal.

"Friday, prayer for all international relationships and all international action, that they may be based on the Christian principles which apply to the individual,—the reign of the Prince of Peace."

The Golden Rule obeyed between man and man, justice and goodwill observed in all social and political action, and Christian principles which apply to the individual extended to all international relations, would indeed inaugurate, or rather constitute, the reign of the Prince of Peace. Christians, now numbered by tens of millions, are deeply responsible for the delay of this reign. The objects here suggested by the Evangelical Alliance are worthy of their most earnest and united prayer not for a single week only, but all the year round. But there is something more important still. Behind the prayer ought to be a character in the Christians themselves corresponding to these great accomplishments for which they are urged to pray. Without this their prayer will be no prayer, but just simply empty words, which God cannot bless, which he veritably loathes. Christian men and women can promote the Kingdom of God in no other way so effectually and rapidly as by actually keeping the Golden Rule, the principles of justice and goodwill, everywhere themselves, and upholding its application in all social and international affairs. After making all due allowance, there is ample ground for the reproach now so often cast upon the church of Jesus Christ and its ministry, that it is one of the chief bulwarks of the war system, with its high-handedness, manifold injustices, its hate and moral loathsomeness. Let all ground for this reproach be removed, let Christian men and women, and Christian organizations of every kind, return in theory and practice to the simple spirit and teachings of their Master, and this very act will be a prayer which will open every window of heaven, and the Kingdom of God will come in like a sunburst of the morning.

South Africa. The breaking out anew of the war in South Africa is too serious either to be encouraging to English hope or gratifying to English pride. While Lord Roberts has been receiving an ovation and all sorts of military "honors" on his return to England, the Boers have been capturing British outposts and executing what seems to be a well-planned invasion into Cape Colony. The English forces have been unable so far either to capture these invading commandos or seriously to interfere with their operations. So serious has the situation become that guns have been landed from the warships at Cape Town, and General Kitchener has called for more mounted troops, and for five thousand men to guard the Rand

mines. Many parts of Cape Colony are reported to be in a rebellious spirit and in thorough sympathy with their kinsmen to the north. Martial law has been declared in several parts of the Colony. How much the severe methods of treatment adopted by the English commanders has had to do with this recrudescence of fighting, is hard to say. These methods are generally confessed to be entirely out of harmony with the rules of "civilized warfare" as they were formulated at The Hague. They have no doubt greatly exasperated the Boers and made them more determined than ever not to submit until forced to do so by the death of all their men. All hopes of a speedy ending of the dreadful conflict are for the moment shattered. The present posture of South African affairs demonstrates anew the utter unreasonableness and inhumanity of war. Ethical considerations are all trampled under foot in the stubborn purpose on the one side to conquer and on the other not to be conquered. Brutality is in the saddle, and on foot too. It is just beastly beating and slashing from beginning to end. The Boers are charged with senselessness in keeping up a hopeless struggle. But with even greater reason may the charge of madness and unreasonableness be laid at the door of England, who not only forced the conflict in the beginning, but has deliberately adopted measures of cruelty condemned even by the average military conscience of the world, in order to crush a little people out of her way and destroy their national existence. It is all folly and only folly, and that continually; and folly always brings ruin in the end, one way or another.

Arbitration Success. Commenting on the settlement of the Franco-Brazilian boundary dispute by arbitration, the *Nation* says:

"International arbitration scores a distinct success in the adjustment of the boundary dispute between French Guiana and the Republic of Brazil. It is impossible to go into a controversy most interesting to geographers, but this much may be said, that before the selection of Switzerland as arbitrator, in 1897, the boundary question was of two hundred years' standing, and three governments in Brazil and half a dozen in France had negotiated without permanent success. The maximum French claim included the coast from the present border of French Guiana to the Amazon, and a vast stretch of the hinterland—in all, four hundred thousand square kilometres, more than two-thirds of the area of France. The final French claim was for two hundred and forty thousand square kilometres, still half their European area. There were all the elements of a serious complication, for valuable mining properties had been discovered in the disputed territory. Many Frenchmen worked these mines, and the establishment of great chartered companies on the English model was confidently expected. It was, in fact, an affray at one of the mining towns that pointed the necessity of immediate arbitration. France is now

the gainer by about eight thousand square miles to the south and west. Brazil retains all the coast line in question, and the line is established upon the natural boundaries of the Oyapock River and the crest of the Tumac-Humac Mountains."

In the Light of Christmas. On Christmas Day Dr. William R. Huntington, pastor of Grace Church, New York, preached a sermon to his people on "War in the Light of Christmas Day." He appealed for the elimination of war from the activities of civilized nations. The greater number of those who make up the population of nominal Christendom still favor war, he claimed; otherwise they would abolish it, for, first or last, the people rule. Not that these people are all anxious to have war break out, but they consider it an inevitable thing which we cannot get rid of. Yet to say that wars shall never cease is to give the lie to Jesus Christ. Only two arguments given in favor of war are worth weighing, he said, the manhood argument and the sovereignty argument. But manhood can be cultivated by other means. The fight with nature shows no signs of slackening. This supplies all the opportunities needed for combat. Dr. Huntington doubted if war produces the sturdy virtues claimed for it. No such evidence is found in the history of France. Devotion to the arts of peace has never wrought a nation's decadence. It is the "pleasant vices" that undo society, and war has never been shown to possess any peculiar efficacy in counteracting their influence. The sovereignty argument he found harder to meet. When two strong nations differ and neither will yield, war of course is inevitable. So it is when two men meet in a narrow path and neither will yield. The duel was once supported by all this specious logic. But the duel has been overthrown, partly by ridicule, partly by an improved public opinion. When public opinion becomes Christianized, wars will cease. Those to whom the trite phrases "the fatherhood of God" and "the brotherhood of man" mean something real and positive and vital, should throw their influence steadily against the growth and spread of the war spirit. The true attitude of this country, which we love so well, is the attitude of friendliness—genuine, cordial friendliness toward all mankind. It might be a great thing to be a world-power, but he could not help believing it a greater as well as a better thing to be a peace-power, "to act as the acknowledged balance-wheel in the complicated mechanism of modern civilization."

Peace Talk, War Practice. In his recently published book, "The Other Man's Country," Mr. Herbert Welsh thus speaks of a class of professedly Christian people who talk peace in time of peace, but support war in practice:

"Nearly all reasonable men admit, in time of peace, or when only wars in which they have no concern are being waged, that war is a great evil, and that they would gladly see it supplanted by some reasonable and peaceful method of settling international disputes, such as a court of arbitration offers. But the same persons — let us suppose them Christians, in order to strengthen the argument — when the nation of which they are a part is slipping into the whirlpool of war, will do nothing to arrest its progress. They abandon any attempt to apply the principles which formerly they professed, to the government of the case of their own nation. They refuse, as though it were disloyal, to make a careful consideration of the facts of the particular conflict under consideration, and content themselves with the vague generalization, 'There are some things worse than war.' Their purpose seems to be to draw their opponent away from a discussion which, if calmly and sincerely conducted, might be profitable, — namely, whether the war in question is right or wrong, — to debate the unsatisfactory topic whether there is anything worse than war. It is clear that but slight moral progress can be made, even towards a condition of less frequent war, unless the professors of ethical religion are willing to lend their aid towards outlawing such wars as they themselves admit have no moral justification. If they will not even take this moderate step forward, then, indeed, little help can be expected from them towards abating those evils which are inseparable from war, no matter how flawlessly orthodox may be their creeds, or how rich and beautiful the services through which they worship the Divine Father."

**Bamboozling
the Creator.**

In a recent article in the *Nation*, entitled "The Clergy Militant," Mr. E. L. Godkin

thus writes of a certain section of the clergy who try to "bamboozle" the Creator as to the nature and object of war :

"Our sacred literature, too, is full of similes drawn from the battlefields. Everything is done by the soldiers themselves to make war seem a picturesque business. The uniform, the serried ranks, the glittering steel, the martial music — all help to quicken the blood of even the most timid, and hide from him the horrors of actual warfare. In fact, an army engaged in the work for which it was embodied and trained undertakes the most shocking and anti-social task to which man can turn himself. Nothing can be more squalid, filthy or inhuman than actual war, and to think that it should be the means of deciding disputes between civilized nations which are capable of producing jurists and publicists of the first rank!"

"The reinforcement of war by the Christian ministry seems to be largely due to the slighter hold which is retained by ministers on their congregations, at least in countries where the voluntary system prevails. The old reverence for the minister no longer exists. In a large number of the country towns he is simply a hired man, whose retention of his place depends largely on his preaching in a way to please the deacons. Consequently, every means has to be resorted to to satisfy the congregation, including agreement with the majority concern-

ing the political questions of the day, such as war. There is no better way of pleasing it, if it be warlike, than praying for 'the success of our arms.' 'The success of our arms,' 'the protection of our soldiers,' are among the numerous phrases by which the preacher seeks to veil from the Almighty the real object of his petition. If preachers would resolutely state with particulars what it is they are asking for, the cause of peace would receive a great impetus; wars would greatly diminish in number, particularly now that the masses have begun to climb up and jostle each other on 'the glory-crowned heights.'

"The attempt usually made to bamboozle the Creator of the universe about the nature and object of war is the grossest attempt of humanity at deception. If preachers were honest, they would, on the outbreak of a war, pray for what actually occurs in every war, successful or unsuccessful. They would approach the Throne of Grace with a petition that the enemy might have his optic nerve cut out by a ball; that he might have his pelvis smashed; that he might be disemboweled; that he might lose one or two legs; that he might lie on the field thirty-six hours, mortally wounded; that he might die of enteric fever; that his provisions and water might give out; that his house might be burned, and his family left roofless and starving. In this way, the real nature of the war would be laid before the public carrying it on, and something would be done to disabuse the minds of the young men and their parents of the idea that war is simply a kind of diversion, in the nature of a football game, which will elevate their character and improve their health and increase their business."

**Carnegie's
Highest Wish.** It is a curious fact that among the most ardent advocates of the abolition of war are found some of the inventors of the most deadly explosives and the most perfect arms. Mr. Nobel, the inventor of dynamite, was a strong opponent of war, and gave one-fifth of his colossal fortune to promote the cause of international peace. It is not difficult to explain his feeling about the matter, for dynamite has many legitimate uses and no necessary relation to the art of war. It is more difficult to understand the mental operations of those who invent instruments having no other use than for war, or who manufacture war materials on a large scale, and who yet profess to be strong opponents of war. Recently an enterprising periodical sent a letter to Mr. Carnegie asking him what of all things he would like to see abolished from the modern practices of governments. He immediately replied: "The slaughter of mankind under the guise of war. I should like to see a stop put to the murder of one man by another under the name of battle. I should like to see the profession of arms, which is so honorable now, made the most dishonorable on the face of the earth." That is a noble sentiment, and we have not the least doubt that Mr. Carnegie is perfectly sincere in uttering it. But one is at once tempted to ask why he does not refuse to manufacture steel plates for battleships, which

are the most terrific instruments of the perpetration of the murder which he wishes to see abolished. That would be a practical application of his wish, which would give the sentiment much greater power. His business would suffer little, as there are so many other lines of steel manufacture in which the great concern is engaged. There are a number of cases on record where wealthy English Friends, engaged in manufacture, have refused large valuable orders from the government for war materials. Has Mr. Carnegie the courage of consistency to put an end at once to the part which, by the manufacture of warship plates, he is taking in "the murder of one man by another under the name of battle"? We do not ask the question in any taunting spirit, but in all Christian seriousness.

Nine Hundred Millions Wasted In the preface to the second edition of the last number of the *Anti-Imperialist*,

Mr. Edward Atkinson shows that the average annual taxation per capita for the expenses of the government for twenty-five years of "peace, order and industry," from 1873 to 1897, was \$4.90, while that for five years under the McKinley Administration, from 1898 to 1902, will have been \$6.84. This amounts to \$148,000,000 per year increase, or \$740,000,000 for the period of five years. To quote Mr. Atkinson's own words:

"To this sum must be added a large and long-continued increase of the pension roll for the support of the widows and children of the dead, and for the maintenance of nearly all the troops which may return from the Philippine Islands alive, with shattered health, after their service in the tropics.

"There is still another aspect of this waste of war. Before it began the expenditures of the country were on the way to rapid reduction to the standard of the true economy and efficiency established by President Hayes, and in the first administration of President Cleveland. The "new navy," so-called, had been built, paid for, and was in service more than adequate for the defense of the country. The pension roll had culminated, and in the natural course was subject to steady and increasing reduction, while the population was rapidly increasing. Had the conduct of the government been continued on the lines of economy and prudence established by President Hayes and continued by President Cleveland in his first term, the expenditures of the five years from 1898 to 1902, inclusive, could not have exceeded the average of \$4.50 per head. They will have been \$6.84. The difference between \$4.50 and \$6.84 is \$2.34 per head, which rate being computed upon the population of the five years falls but a fraction short of \$900,000,000, a sum equal to nine-tenths of the debt-bearing interest now outstanding. This huge sum, derived mainly by taxation upon the necessities and comforts of life, paid by the masses of the people in proportion to their consumption, has been wasted in five years of war with Spain, the larger part of the waste having been incurred in the con-

duct of the futile effort to deprive the people of the Philippine Islands of their liberty and to subjugate them by force of arms."

Captain Heygate of the British army, Destruction of Horses in War. who was a short time ago ordered home from Kansas City, where he has been buying horses for South Africa, has been commanded to remain and buy fifty thousand more. Few people have any conception of the frightful way in which war destroys horses. Forty days after the horses are purchased in Kansas City they are landed in South Africa. Thirty-two per thousand of them die on shipboard, because of the heat of the tropics through which they pass. Because of the urgent need, they are, on landing, hurried at once to the front, without being allowed time for rest after the long voyage. The hardships which they are put through in this weakened condition soon kill them off. On an average they live only six weeks after landing. It costs the British government three hundred and sixty dollars per head for the horses bought in this country by the time they are landed at the Cape. Since the beginning of the Boer war, one hundred thousand horses and mules have been purchased in this country, to say nothing of the large numbers sent from England and those purchased elsewhere. The renewal of hostilities by the Boers has made more horses a necessity, and so fifty thousand more of the innocent dumb creatures—eighteen millions of dollars worth of them—are to be sent over to be sacrificed to the merciless god of war. The British government proposes to mount fifty thousand of the imperial infantry in addition to the twenty-five thousand police already mounted. The "civilization" of war is much vaunted in these "Christian" days; but there is no sign of any horse civilization in it! The changed tactics and methods of war brought about by the new long-range rifles and cannon make it increasingly cruel to the poor beasts which are driven at full spur, in order to outmaneuver the enemy in regard to position. Such unfeelingness and enormous wastefulness in any other direction than that of war would be considered in our day the height of inhumanity and inanity, and anybody guilty of such things would be unceremoniously driven out of all decent society. But war lifts the crudest, the meanest and the most inhuman things to the level of the highest morality! Does it? Who, in the growing light of our time, dares to face his conscience and say that it does?

Isthmian Canal. It is to be regretted that the Hay-Pauncefote canal treaty was not ratified as originally drafted. It was on a high plane, in harmony with the spirit which ought to govern nowadays everywhere in international affairs. All inter-

national waterways, whether natural or artificial, and by whomsoever built and controlled, ought to be open on equal terms to the ships of all nations. They ought, therefore, to be neutralized, and to make their neutralization complete and inviolable all the important nations ought to be parties to the treaty. For all this the Hay-Pauncefote treaty provided. The Senate, before ratification, amended the treaty, making it supersede the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, omitting from it the invitation to other powers to adhere to it, and providing that the United States shall not be prevented by the previous stipulations of the treaty from taking such measures as it "may find it necessary to take for securing by its own forces the defense of the United States and the maintenance of public order." Though the treaty as amended is inferior to the original draft, there is no very grave objection to it. It still leaves the canal, if built, neutralized by the two countries and open alike to the ships of all nations, and provides that no fortifications shall be erected to command it. The Davis amendment, which in substance provides for the defense of the canal by the United States forces in time of war, is the one especially objectionable to England. The treaty as amended has been sent by the President, without comment, to Lord Salisbury, and nothing further about the building of the canal will probably be done until an answer is received. Delay also is reported to be occasioned by opposition from some of the transcontinental railways, which are said to wish the whole project defeated, that they may control all the freight traffic between the two sides of the continent. It is unfortunate that home greed, national ambition and international fear and jealousy should block the progress of so great and valuable an enterprise. The canal is already much needed, and if commerce continues to increase as during the decades of the past century, both the projected canals will hardly be sufficient to supply the demand twenty-five years hence. A canal across the isthmus built under the proper conditions and absolutely neutralized for all time would be a great instrument of international friendship and peace.

Ship Subsidies. We are in favor of every legitimate and fair means of building up our national merchant marine. But it is neither legitimate nor fair to do this by giving subsidies out of the public treasury to certain individuals or companies, that they may be able to construct and operate ships at a handsome profit. Even if the effect of such subsidies could be shown to be increased national prosperity, of which there is very grave doubt, they would still be wrong in principle and mischievous somewhere in practice. It is unfair to make the people of other lines of trade and industry contribute to the support of those engaged in

one special line. If the carrying business is to be subsidized, there is quite as much reason for giving bounties to a hundred other kinds of business, many of which are much more intimately related to the national welfare than this. If the government itself were operating the ships, and they failed to pay expenses, it would be perfectly right in principle to tax the whole people to make up the loss. But if private companies cannot do the business profitably, that is their own concern. If the government, however, is guilty, as ours has been, of imposing restrictions here and there which make an important industry like ship-building and the carrying trade unprofitable, it is its clear duty to remove these obstacles and let the business have a fair chance. Remove the high duties on ship-building materials, and the merchant marine would speedily take care of itself. It is worse still to subsidize merchant or mail ships out of national pride and the simple desire to beat other countries. We have no sympathy with the spirit of national buncombe which we fear is behind the ship subsidy bill. If we undertake to take away the carrying trade of Great Britain and other countries by mean of subsidies, they will be provoked to increase their subsidies, and we shall be in no better condition than now. So long as the ships of other countries, with or without subsidies, can carry American exports cheaper than American ships, and it is more profitable for American capital to be invested in other forms of business, there is no good reason why we should attempt to upset that which is profitable all around. On both economic and moral grounds the Hanna ship subsidy bill should be "put to rest."

Liquor and Firearms. At the convention of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union held in Washington early in December a petition was prepared to the President, another to Congress, and identical petitions to all the great powers, protesting against the sale of firearms and the importation of liquor and opium into the Philippine Islands or the island possessions of the other powers addressed. The petition to the President pointed out that it has been the policy of America to forbid the sale of intoxicants to the Indian tribes, and that England, which has had the greatest experience of all the colonizing powers of the world, has been forced to adopt a prohibition policy in her colonies in Africa and elsewhere. The petition, therefore, asked that the President, either through the War Department or the Philippine Commission, should extend the prohibition law of the Indian Territory so as to take in the Philippine Islands. A petition to the Senate urged the ratification of the pending treaty for the protection of Central Africa against intoxicants. A petition to Great Britain, France, Germany, Spain, Holland, Belgium,

Sweden and Norway, Denmark, Austria-Hungary, Greece, Russia, Turkey, Persia and Japan, asked for an international treaty forbidding the sale of intoxicants, opium and firearms in all islands and other regions inhabited chiefly by aboriginal tribes. We are glad that this great organization of women had the courage to enter these solemn protests, but we much fear that, with the influences now dominant at Washington, their words will pass as idle tales. Now is "the hour and power" of firearms and liquor.

Philippine Situation. The six weeks have passed at the end of which we were promised the cessation of hostilities in the Philippines, if McKinley were reelected, and there is not the faintest sign of any collapse in the opposition to United States sovereignty. In fact, during the whole two years since the war broke out, conditions have never been worse than they are now. There are nearly eighty thousand American troops in the islands. The losses from ambuscades, petty battles and other causes have been as great the past two months as at any former period of the conflict. This was the special plea, put in by the War Department during the debate on the army bill in the House before the holidays, for the immediate passing of the bill. It has been perfectly evident from the beginning, to all unbiased minds, that if the islands are to be forced into submission, a large army will be necessary for many years to come. The War Department, now that it suits its purpose to do so, comes out boldly and confesses this. Why did it not do so sooner? Why did the President and his supporters hold out such flattering hopes of the speedy cessation of fighting? They had the same data as the rest of us. They had much more. Why did the Denby Commission and the Taft Commission and General Otis send home such colored accounts of the prospects of peace? Why was General MacArthur's report of cold, hard facts kept back from the public so long? There are only two ways of accounting for these proceedings. Either all these supporters of the administration's policy, the President himself included, were grossly and stupidly ignorant of the real facts, or they deliberately made the effort to deceive the people. Whichever of the alternatives they choose to take, they are unworthy of the support of the people any longer in the matter of the Philippines. There is already evidence of a considerable reaction among those who have had the utmost confidence in the clear-sightedness, sincerity and wisdom of the administration. This ought to be so powerful and widespread in the country as to compel a reversal of the criminal policy so far pursued. The only honorable way out of the present situation is confession and immediate abandonment of the sin still in process of commission. There is yet time. If the policy

is persisted in, not only months, but more probably years of sad and shameful history-making is before the country, the most disheartening part of which is not the loss of life and the great cost in money, heavy as these will be.

Delays in China. One ought not to expect a muddle which has been fifty years in developing to be cleared up in a day. Especially is this the case when some of the efforts towards solution are such as inevitably tend to make "confusion worse confounded." The note sent at the end of December by the representatives of the powers in Pekin to the Chinese government, after detailing the massacres and other outrages committed against foreigners, and the measures taken by the powers to prevent the Boxers from further cruelties, outlines the terms to which China must agree before peace negotiations can begin. Some of the demands made in this note are reasonable, as international standards now are, and such as the Chinese government has expressed itself ready and willing to conform to, in order to make reparation for the wrongs done and to put an end to the disturbances. But others of them are out of all reason, and evince a disposition on the part of the western nations to continue the policy of aggression and extortion which they have followed in past years, and which has resulted in such terrible retaliation. The demand that no arms or materials for the manufacture of arms shall be imported, and that certain forts shall be destroyed and that certain points shall be occupied as military posts is one that no nation would accept unless compelled by overwhelming force to do so. This demand strikes at the independence of China, and if insisted on and carried out by any possibility, would reduce the empire to abject vassalage. Non-importation of arms and the destruction of forts would be a good thing if voluntarily undertaken by the Chinese authorities. But if the attempt is made to enforce these things from without, the effect will be the further exasperation of the Chinese and their instigation to develop by secret methods their armament farther than they would naturally do. It is perfect folly to try to prevent by force a people like the Chinese, who have already learned the art of manufacturing arms, from developing its armament to a formidable one. These demands will make it difficult for the Chinese Commissioners to sign the protocol, and we may expect troublesome delays to result. If they should ultimately sign under instructions from the imperial government, the result will be very bad sometime in the future. One is inclined to wonder if the powers have not put forward these demands for the express purpose, on their certain rejection, of making further political inroads on the empire. Not one of the western nations which have been the chief guilty cause

of the recent anti-foreign uprising shows any consciousness of its political transgressions. Until such is the case, and a new policy entered upon, dictated by goodwill and respect for others, the prospect of peace and settled order in the Far East will be a very shadowy one.

Opportunity for Arbitration. Opportunities for arbitration of international questions are constantly arising, and the new court at The Hague is likely to have plenty of business from the very start. Nor do we believe that the cases at first referred to it will be necessarily trifling ones, as has been supposed by many persons to whom the difficulties in the way of resort to arbitration have looked frightfully large. The cases going to the court will be those first arising, whether small or great interests are involved. Nor is it always easy to discriminate and say what are and what are not important questions. It has already been proposed by the Czar of Russia that the question of indemnity in the Chinese trouble be referred to the Hague court. Nobody would call this an insignificant case. Somebody has suggested that the Alaska boundary question also be put into the court's hands. And now comes the suggestion that there may be opportunity for the court to have a hand in the Nicaragua Canal question. The *Watchman* thus speaks of it:

"The suggestion is made that in case the British statesmen are not disposed to concede the right of the United States to abrogate the Bulwer-Clayton treaty without Great Britain's consent, the whole question whether or not the United States has the right to repudiate this contract might properly be submitted to the Hague tribunal of arbitration, which the United States was instrumental in creating. Moreover, since our government has formally endorsed the scheme of international arbitration advanced by the Hague Conference, and has appointed its representatives on that tribunal, it could hardly decline to permit the principles of the Hague Conference to be applied to itself. The question at issue is one that is peculiarly appropriate for the consideration of such a tribunal; it is strictly a legal one, namely, whether one party to a treaty, which, contrary to the usual custom, does not contain any provision either for amendment or abrogation, can rightfully repudiate its stipulations without the consent of the other nation with which the agreement was made."

Brevities.

. . . Of the governments to which the Berne Peace Bureau sent a copy of the resolutions of the Paris Peace Congress, those of Great Britain, Italy, Switzerland, Denmark, and the Netherlands have already acknowledged the reception of the communication, the latter two expressing their appreciation of the work of the Congress.

. . . At the Spanish-American Congress which met recently in Spain, Senator Marcoartu, of Madrid, offered a resolution in favor of universal obligatory arbitration. This received the approval of the delegates of all the thirteen states represented except Chili.

. . . We join in the grief everywhere felt by the friends of peace at the sudden death of Mrs. Frederic Passy, wife of the distinguished and devoted leader of the peace movement in France. She was stricken down while he was away from home delivering an address, and died before he reached home. We extend to Mr. Passy our sincerest sympathy.

. . . The Lombard Peace Union of Milan has addressed to the government and people of Italy a powerful protest against the pillage and massacres perpetrated by the European troops in China, and asks for the speedy withdrawal of the Italian troops.

. . . Mr. Nicholas Fleva, a prominent peace worker and member of the Berne Peace Bureau, has been chosen minister plenipotentiary of Roumania at Rome. He has been twice a member of the Roumanian ministry.

. . . The Friends of Great Britain, who have always been the leaders in the movement for international arbitration and peace, have reason to feel great satisfaction that one of their number, Sir Edward Fry, a retired justice of the High Court of Appeal, has been appointed a member of the permanent international court of arbitration.

. . . The Swiss state council, composed of forty-four members, two from each canton, ratified on the third of December all of the acts of the Hague Conference except the convention concerning the laws and customs of land warfare. This was not approved on the ground that it does not permit the *levée en masse* of a people whose territory is invaded by an enemy.

. . . On the twenty-first of November the government of Portugal deposited with the Bank of England the money to pay the English stockholders of the Delagoa Bay Railway the indemnity awarded by the Swiss arbitrators, and with the American embassy in London the amount coming to the American stockholders.

. . . The Swiss Federal Council, to which was referred the Franco-Brazilian boundary dispute, rendered its decision on the first of December, giving to Brazil 252,000 square kilometres of the disputed area and to France 8,000.

. . . The twentieth century opens with the money stock of the world standing at \$11,600,000,000, the increase in thirty years being over one hundred per cent.

. . . "The effect of the vast military systems of Germany, Russia and France on the life of these people and on their civil and social institutions, such as the family, the school, literature, is evil, and only evil. It means the exhaustion of the higher forces of civilization. It means that forces which ought to make for human happiness and betterment are either not working to secure those mighty results or are directly and positively contributing to human misery and disintegration." — President Charles F. Thwing.

. . . *L'Accord* of Paris quotes more than forty French papers which have discussed the work of the Women's Universal Peace Alliance, most of them speaking of it in terms of the heartiest appreciation and sympathy.

. . . The treasury estimates for the next fiscal year for all purposes are \$743,874,804, of which \$113,019,044 is for the army, \$87,172,430 for the navy, \$12,461,193 for fortifications, \$1,045,750 for the military academy, and \$145,245,230 for pensions.